

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 EVA D. AL-ZAGHARI,

11 Petitioner,

No. CIV S-08-1698 KJM P

12 vs.

13 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

14 Respondents.

ORDER

15 _____/
16 Petitioner, a civil committee proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ
17 of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, together with a request to proceed in forma
18 pauperis. This court will not rule on petitioner's request to proceed in forma pauperis.

19 The proceedings against petitioner arose in San Mateo County and it appears that
20 petitioner is confined in San Mateo County as well. San Mateo County is in an area embraced
21 by the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

22 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C § 2241(d), courts in both the district of commitment and the
23 district of confinement have concurrent jurisdiction over applications for habeas corpus filed by
24 state prisoners. Because petitioner was not convicted in this district, and is not presently
25 confined here, this court does not have jurisdiction to entertain the application.

26 /////

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. This court has not ruled on petitioner's request to proceed in forma pauperis;
- and
2. This matter is transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d); 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

DATED: August 7, 2008.



U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

2/mp
alza1698.108b